

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-26 and 38 remain pending in this application. Claims 27-37 and 39-42 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 13, 17, and 38 have been amended.

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for his consideration during the telephone interview of July 20, 2004. During that interview, applicant's representatives discussed a proposed amendment to claim 1. Claim 1 has been amended as discussed along with additional amendments.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-2, 7-13, 17-20, and 25-26 under U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ogdon and rejected claims 3-6, 14-16, and 21-24 under U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogdon in view of Carmel. The claims have been amended to clarify that the altering of the presentation timeline of a media stream in order to resynchronize the media stream is performed at a client computer system. For example, claim 1 recites "altering at the client computer a presentation timeline." None of the cited references, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests altering at a client computer system a presentation timeline of a media stream, in response to detecting global unsynchronization between media streams, to resynchronize the media streams.

Ogdon teaches sending a lower resolution version of a presentation if the presentation is running behind a predetermined performance schedule. For example, a first client may receive a presentation as an ordered series of segments presented in full animation, while a second client may receive the presentation as a simple slide show, due to, for example, network transmission slowdowns. (Ogdon 3:44-62.) Alternatively, a presenter (not a client) may define a script such that portions of a presentation may be skipped if the presentation is running behind the predetermined performance schedule. (Ogdon 25:65-67.)

Ogdon does not, however, teach that a client computer system alters the presentation timeline of a media stream that it receives to synchronize it with other media streams, as claimed. Rather, Ogdon describes that a server can send a lower

resolution version of the presentation, or a presenter can decide to skip a portion of the presentation, to conform it to a predetermined performance schedule.

The Examiner has objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) as not showing every feature of the invention (i.e., compressing a presentation time line, omitting selected frames, and altering each media stream). Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant submits that the drawings, in conjunction with the specification, adequately show all of the claimed features. "Compressing a presentation timeline" is described in the specification at, for example, 3:22-25, 4:4-9, and 12:16-20. "Omitting selected frames" is described in the specification at, for example, 13:7-9 and 16:10-12. "Altering each stream of the plurality" is described in the specification at, for example, 19:16-18 (slowing down the rendering of the media streams implicitly includes the possibility of altering each of the media streams) and 20:20-21 (by returning to the initial monitoring step, each media stream may be altered by repeatedly following the process shown in Figure 4).

Steps 138 and 146 of Figure 4, which "show" modifying a presentation timeline according to a time modification factor, clearly include any or all these features. For example, the specification, at 12:13–13:14, describes compressing a timeline, or omitting selected frames from a timeline (both forms of modifying a timeline), based on a speed factor (i.e., a time modification factor). Thus, the specification clearly explains that the "modifying" steps shown in Figure 4 may include compressing a presentation timeline, or omitting selected frames, etc.

It would be unduly burdensome to require a separate drawing for each and every type of modification described in the specification. Furthermore, one of ordinary skill in the art would readily recognize that the term "modifying" in Figure 4 is clearly intended to encompass all forms of modification described in the specification, including compressing a timeline and omitting frames from a timeline. Thus, these features are adequately shown in Figure 4.


With respect to "altering each stream of the plurality," the specification, at 19:16-18, describes slowing down (or speeding up) the rendering of the media streams, which

implicitly includes the possibility of altering each of the media streams. Moreover, the flowchart illustrated in Figure 4 shows that the process returns to the monitoring step after a presentation timeline is modified. Thus, by repeatedly performing the steps illustrated in the flowchart of Figure 4, each media stream may be altered. Accordingly, the applicant requests that the drawing objections be withdrawn.

Based on the above amendments and remarks, applicant respectfully request reconsideration of this application and its early allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (206) 359-8548.

Respectfully submitted,

Perkins Coie LLP



Maurice J. Pirio

Registration No. 33,273

Date: September 7, 2004

**Correspondence Address:**

Customer No. 25096

Perkins Coie LLP

P.O. Box 1247

Seattle, Washington 98111-1247

(206) 359-8000

(206) 359-7198 (Fax)

Attorneys for Applicant